

## Dec. 13, 2013 Monitor Metadata Participant Questions and Answers

1. Would meteorological monitors at a SLAMS site (no met requirement) that are currently tagged as Special Purpose be changed to OTHER?
  - a. Answer: No. Met parameters at SMALS sites were not changed to "OTHER".
2. What monitor type would meteorological parameters assign to? (Patricia Maliro)
  - a. Answer: If they are at a site with monitors that have a recognized monitor type (e.g. SLAMS, TRIBAL, INDUSTRIAL), then I would expect them to be assigned to that type; otherwise, I would expect them to be assigned to OTHER".
3. From the state of Ohio regarding the monitor method screen. I manually entered end dates for parameters at existing sites where sampling has ended. Will that create problems? I noticed with batch submission of the MN transaction with closing dates that AQS rejects MN records error message, Security Violation. You do not have permissions to update this data. Can you comment on this?
  - a. Answer: This appears to be a software bug that we will investigate and fix.
4. So are States now allowed to submit a monitor type of NCORE rather than Proposed NCORE?
  - a. Answer: No, the NCORE monitor type needs to be reviewed and approved by the OAQPS monitoring group; i.e. submit PROPOSED NCORE, and if it is approved, we will change it to NCORE.
5. Would the pollutant "NO" (42601), not at an NCORE location, be an "OTHER"? Or would it be SLAMs (since this pollutant is required, under NCORE - though this site is not NCORE)? (Region 1)
  - a. Answer: No, the parameter "NO" (42601) should have the same monitor type as the NO<sub>2</sub> monitor at the site.
6. Will we be required to submit data using xml (Chuck Fazio)
  - a. Answer: No, delimited transactions will be accepted for the foreseeable future.
7. Also from the state of Ohio, when entering a closing date on a MA transaction in order to close out a parameter, the new MM page in AQS does not get populated with the closing data as defined in MA. Please comment.
  - a. Answer: This appears to be a software bug that we will fix.
8. It was my understanding that submitting metadata with the raw data (i.e., concentrations) was optional, is that still the case? (Clarification of question: Do they need to submit the monitor metadata with every raw data submission?)
  - a. Answer: No, it just needs to be submitted once for the monitor.
9. Is EPA considering Near Road Monitors as a separate Network Affiliation. This could be informative.
  - a. Answer: Yes, it will have "NEAR-ROAD" as the network affiliation. This has been loaded into AQS.
10. If a monitor is currently assigned the Non-Regulatory monitor type, will we need to submit a Monitor NAAQS Exclusion each year (in other words, is the end date field of the MX transaction required)?
  - a. Answer: No, for any monitor metadata with a date range, the end date is not required.

11. Did the new POC guidance apply for instances where multiple monitors all with the same collection method are used to collect the primary data record?
  - a. Answer: Yes. These should be separate POCs.
12. We are using PM2.5 TEOMs in our network. There are numerous method codes for this type of monitor based on inlet type and operating temperature. While inlet type should not change frequently, our temperatures can change twice a year. In the spring we might go from operating at 30 degrees to operating at 50 degrees and in the fall we might go back to 30 degrees. It is the same monitor, i.e., we are not using multiple physical monitors to meet a sampling frequency objective. By changing the operating temperature we are trying to ensure that the monitor can operate effectively at the values we have set it at. How should we handle this? I do not feel that it would be appropriate to split the data up into two different monitor IDs in AQS.
  - a. Answer: This should be a single monitor (POC). Presently, AQS is designed to require you to submit a new Monitor Method when the method code changed. We will investigate options for minimizing the effort required.
13. Is it possible for us to get guidance from the EPA monitoring group on what they would prefer the Monitor Type and Network Affiliation be for the specific programs?
  - a. Answer: I am assuming that by "specific program" you mean a program like NCORE. If this is the case, then the program name will be the network affiliation, and the monitor type should be SLAMS or "OTHER" depending on whether or not it is required under 40 CFR Part 58.
14. Would NATTS sites be considered SLAMS too?
  - a. Answer: By the above rule, since NAATS is not required by Part 58, it does not have to be SLAMS. However, it is up the discretion of the monitoring agency (i.e. either "SLAMS" or "OTHER" would be allowed).
15. Can you give examples of pollutants (not met) that might fit as "other"?
  - a. Answer: Examples include the following at monitors with no network affiliation:
    - i. 12114 -- Copper (TSP) STP and similar TSP STP metals,
    - ii. 16742 -- 2-Chloronaphthalene (TSP) STP and other TSP/STP organics,
    - iii. 43824 -- Trichloroethylene
    - iv. 85184 -- Sodium PM10 LC